

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITY STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/804,288	03/12/2001	Jacobus Haartsen	040071-535	8551	
7:	590 09/20/2004		040071-535 855  EXAMINER  HO, DUC CHI	INER	
Ronald L. Grudziecki BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P			HO, DUC CHI		
P.O. Box 1404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Alexandria, V	4 22313-1404		2665		

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	· — —	
	09/804,288	HAARTSEN, JA	HAARTSEN, JACOBUS	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	7	
	Duc C Ho	2665	4	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence a	ddress	
Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE. THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become a	a reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered tim DNTHS from the mailing date of this ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12	2 March 2001.			
, ,	This action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		tters, prosecution as to th	ne merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are pending in the applicat	ion.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-31</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		b by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	rection is required if the drawin	g(s) is objected to. See 37 (	CFR 1.121(d).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form F	PTO-152.	
riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the p application from the International Bur	ents have been received. ents have been received in priority documents have bee	Application No	al Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	t received.		
ttachment(s)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)		
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/		o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (P1	ГО-152)	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date $\underline{4}$ .	6) Other: _		·,	

Art Unit: 2665

**Detailed Action** 

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable Wilson J.Y. et al. ("Inside Bluethooth part I and open Spec. for Wireless Communication" IDS record), hereinafter referred to as Willson, in view of Pritty et al. (US 4,819,229), hereinafter referred to as Pritty

Regarding claim 1, Wilson discloses a Bluetooth technology for wireless communication and networking between PCs, mobile phones and other devices, see page 62-left column.

According to Wilson, a master device requires determination of a channel (hopping sequence) and phase (timing offset) that shall be used by all radios (the slave units) that need to communicate, wherein a Bluetooth channel comprising of a defined hopping sequence, by jumping form one RF channel to another in a pseudoradom sequence, for a period of time or slot, see page 65. In Wilson the SCO (Synchronous Connection-Oriented links) protocol enables the guaranteed bandwidth through a reservation of a particular number of slots in the Bluetooth channel, see page 66, right column (corresponding to allocating reserved time slots to communication units based on QOS requirements associated with the communication units).

Art Unit: 2665

Wilson however, doesn't teach (1) the pseudo-token is automatically assigned to a communication unit during its reserved time slot; (2) assigning priority levels to communication units transmitting on the communication channel; and (3) interrupting the pseudo-token based channel access scheme when a communication unit's reserved time slot is overridden by a transmission from a higher priority communication unit.

One skill in the art would recognize the advantage of (1) implementing an access scheme assigning a token to a communication unit during its reserved time slot, (2) assigning priority levels to communication units transmitting on the communication channel, and (3) interrupting the token based channel access scheme when a communication unit's reserved time slot is overridden by a transmission from a higher priority communication unit such that to permit higher priority message to obtain access to the shared transmission medium even when a lower priority message is being transmitted in the medium.

Pritty discloses a local area network priority control system. The network of Pritty employs token passing to terminals with different priorities (fig. 4, col. 7, lines 6-53), including priority control channel (fig. 5, col. 7-line 52 to col. 8-line 6). The local area network system permits host computers having a higher priority than the priority of the circulating token to obtain access to the ring and suspend transmission of the message on the ring by utilizing an extra control channel, designated "priority interrupt control channel" (PICC) so that any node can request a less important transmission to be suspended using a within packet interrupt, see col. 6, lines 49-57.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time invention was made, to employ the teaching of Pritty as described above into the system of Wilson such that that to permit a device with higher priority to obtain access to the shared transmission medium

Art Unit: 2665

even when another device with lower priority having data being transmitted in the medium in order to provide a multiple priority system, and to solve contention resolution in an ad hoc wireless connectivity.

Regarding claim 2, Wilson discloses the receiving step at a master unit, an access request from a slave unit.

Regarding claim 3, Wilson's system is capable of allocating a maximum packet size to a slave unit based on the QOS request.

Regarding claim 4, Wilson's system is capable of assigning time offsets between the reserved time slots allocated to the slave units.

Regarding claim 5, please see the rejection of claim 1. Pritty's terminals is able to receive a priority level based on the request.

Regarding claims 6-7, please see the rejection of claim 1. In Pritty the local area network system permits host computers having a higher priority than the priority of the circulating token to obtain access to the ring and suspend transmission of the message on the ring by utilizing an extra control channel, designated "priority interrupt control channel" (PICC) so that any node can request a less important transmission to be suspended using a within packet interrupt

Regarding claims 8, 16, and 24, these claims have similar limitations as claim 1.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claims 9, 17, and 25, these claims have similar limitations as claim 2. Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 2.

Regarding claims 10, 18, and 26, these claims have similar limitations as claim 3.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 3.

Art Unit: 2665

Regarding claims 11, 19, and 27, these claims have similar limitations as claim 4.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 4.

Regarding claims 12, 20, and 28, these claims have similar limitations as claim 5.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 5.

Regarding claims 13, 21, and 29, these claims have similar limitations as claim 6.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 6.

Regarding claims 14, 22, and 30, please see the rejection of claim 1. In Wilson the master unit is able to pass the token to the slave unit which had its transmission time slot overridden.

Regarding claims 15, 23, and 31, these claims have similar limitations as claim 7.

Therefore, they are rejected under Wilson-Pritty for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 7.

## Conclusion

- 3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sun et al. (US 6,751,213) is cited to show system and method for providing quality of service and contention resolution in ad-hoc communication systems, which is considered pertinent to the claimed invention.
- 4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-3147. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2665

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu, can be reached on (571) 272-3155.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

5. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patent Examiner

Lulyto-

Duc Ho

09-14-04